



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,065	12/20/2000	Michael Hachigian	10003586-1	1610

7590 03/04/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,065

Applicant(s)

HACHIGIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Ting Zhou

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-25 and 27-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-25 and 27-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 23 January 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-28 as amended are pending in the application. Of the above claims, claims 2 and 26 have been cancelled by the applicant and are therefore withdrawn from consideration.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract is objected to because the use of "said manual" on line 16 and "said customized interactive training sequence" on line 21 is inappropriate. The use of legal

phraseology of the claims should be avoided in the abstract. The abstract is further objected to because it is not limited to a single paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 9-10, 12-14 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by L'Allier et al. U.S. Patent 6,606,480.

Referring to claim 9, L'Allier et al. teach an interactive system and method for providing product service and support information to a user (providing, or teaching a skill to the user), as recited in column 1, lines 65-67 and column 2, lines 1-2. Specifically, L'Allier et al. teach a

Art Unit: 2173

documentation module for displaying the product service information in a user understandable format responsive to user selection, a simulator module for playing at least one interactive animated simulation in a user understandable format responsive to user selection, a customization module for customizing an interactive sequence responsive to a user response to a set of predefined questions, and a training module for playing the customized interactive training sequence in a user understandable format responsive to user selection, as recited in column 3, lines 5-30 and column 5, lines 6-25.

Referring to claim 10, L'Allier et al. teach storing the produce service information as a plurality of digital files, wherein each is designated by a Uniform Resource Locator (storing the training material on a web implemented system by providing linkage to external sources via the internet) (column 13, lines 59-67 and column 14, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 12, L'Allier et al. teach the system for displaying product service information (displaying training material for learning a skill) as a web based system, as recited in column 4, lines 46-52.

Referring to claim 13, L'Allier et al. teach at least one interactive animated simulation requiring user response before the next sequence is played to the user (user enters a response to displayed question before next question is displayed), as recited in column 3, lines 14-18.

Referring to claim 14, L'Allier et al. teach part of the customized training sequence requiring user response before the next sequence is played to the user (user enters a response to displayed question before next question is displayed and also, user progresses through each of the sequence of instructional units presented), as recited in column 3, lines 14-30.

Referring to claim 27, L'Allier et al. teach a computer system (column 2, lines 33-35) for providing an interactive product service manual (L'Allier et al. teach providing, or teaching a skill to the user, which provides the same functionality as a product service manual, which teaches the user skills) (column 1, lines 65-67 and column 2, lines 1-2) comprising means for displaying documents of the manual responsive to user selection, means for playing at least one interactive animated simulation responsive to user selection, means for customizing an interactive training sequence responsive to user response to a set of predefined questions and means for playing the customized interactive training sequence responsive to user selection (column 3, lines 5-30).

Referring to claim 28, L'Allier et al. teach a method being executed by a computer system connected to a LAN (column 4, lines 46-48) and comprising providing hyperlinks to the content of the interactive product service manual (storing the training material on a web implemented system by providing linkage to external sources via the internet) (column 13, lines 59-67 and column 14, lines 1-4), displaying at least one documentation responsive to user selection, playing at least one interactive animated simulation responsive to user selection, customizing an interactive training sequence responsive to user responses to a set of predefined questions and playing the customized interactive training sequence responsive to user selection, as recited in column 3, lines 5-30.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over L'Allier et al. U.S. Patent 6,606,480, in view of Cook et al. U.S. Patent 6,427,063.

Referring to claims 1, 5 and 6, L'Allier et al. teach a system and method for providing product service and support information to a user (providing, or teaching a skill to the user), including automatically customizing an interactive training sequence (interactive learning environment), as recited in column 1, lines 65-67 and column 2, lines 1-2. Specifically, L'Allier et al. teach the system presenting at least one set of predefined questions to the user for gathering information about the user, a customization module for customizing the content of the training sequence responsive to the user's responses to the set of predefined questions (producing a training regimen based on the user responses to the evaluation questions), as recited in column 3, lines 5-30. L'Allier further teaches a training module for playing the customized training sequence in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (allowing users to progress through the sequence of instructional units displayed on the screen) (column 3, lines 25-30), wherein the customized training sequence is stored as a plurality of digital files, each designated by a Uniform Resource Locator (storing the training material on a web implemented system by providing linkage to external sources via the internet) (column 13, lines 59-67 and column 14, lines 1-4). However, L'Allier et al. fail to explicitly teach the system storing at least one login

identification supplied by the user for uniquely linking the customized training sequence to the user. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. teach storing at least one login identification supplied by the user to uniquely link the customized training sequence to the user (user passwords that allow them to access the system) (column 24, lines 21-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service and product support information of L'Allier et al. to include the linking of a user to his training sequence, as taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to associate each training sequence with its user, allowing them to easily access the training sequence again in the future. Furthermore, by having a unique login for the user, he is given the flexibility of being able to stop the training and resume it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the training lessons already taken.

Referring to claims 3 and 7, L'Allier et al. fail to teach the training module saving the progress of the training sequence linked to the login identification. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. further teach the ability of the training module to save the progress of the customized training sequence linked to a login identification. They do this by teaching the updating of the training module to reflect the progress (for example, the use of a certain tool or task) of a particular user (column 11, lines 32-37 and column 12, lines 46-56).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service and

product support information of L'Allier et al. to include the saving of the progress of the user taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to give users the flexibility of being able to stop the training in the middle and come back to it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lesson he has already taken.

Referring to claims 4 and 8, L'Allier et al. fail to teach retrieving the customized training sequence according to the last saved progress responsive to user login of the login identification. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. further teach, retrieving the customized training sequence according to the last saved progress responsive to user login (managing and controlling the training materials presented to the student according to the usage characteristics of that particular student), as recited in column 6, lines 29-32. Since the reference disclosed the ability to record and store a student's progress (column 1, line 60) and the ability to keep track of the relative position of the student in the lesson, the system is able to retrieve the training sequence according to the last saved position of the sequence. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service and product support information of L'Allier et al. to include retrieval of the training sequence according to the last saved progress, as taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to give users the flexibility of being able to stop the training in the middle and come back to it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lesson he has already taken.

Art Unit: 2173

6. Claims 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over L'Allier et al. U.S. Patent 6,606,480, as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Cook et al. U.S. Patent 6,427,063.

Referring to claim 17, L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claim 9 above. Specifically, L'Allier et al. teach a customization module which prompts the user to respond to a set of predefined questions (column 3, lines 5-26). However, L'Allier et al. fail to teach a unique login identification selected by the user. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. teach a login identification supplied by the user (user passwords that allows them to access the system) (column 24, lines 21-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service information of L'Allier et al. to include the login identification taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to associate each training sequence with its user, allowing them to easily access the training sequence again in the future. Furthermore, by having a unique login for the user, he is given the flexibility of being able to stop the training and resume it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lessons already learned.

Referring to claim 18, L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 9 and 17 above. Specifically, L'Allier et al. teach the customization module returning a custom training sequence according to user responses from the set of predefined questions (producing a training regimen based on the user responses to the evaluation questions), as recited in column 3, lines 5-30. However, L'Allier et al. fail to teach linking the training sequence to a unique login

identification. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. teach linking the custom training sequence to the unique login identification (managing and controlling the training materials presented to the student according to the usage characteristics of that particular student, where students are identified by their login identification, or password), as recited in column 6, lines 29-32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service information of L'Allier et al. to include the login identification taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to associate each training sequence with its user, allowing them to easily access the training sequence again in the future. Furthermore, by having a unique login for the user, he is given the flexibility of being able to stop the training and resume it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lessons already learned.

Referring to claims 19, 20 and 21, while L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 9, 17 and 18 above, they fail to teach the training module saving the progress of the training sequence linked to the login identification. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. further teach the ability of the training module to save the progress of the customized training sequence (which saves all of the training materials within the sequence, including the Uniform Resource Locators) linked to a unique login identification. They do this by teaching the updating of the training module to reflect the progress (for example, the use of a certain tool or task) of a particular user (column 11, lines 32-37 and column 12, lines 46-56).). It would have been

Art Unit: 2173

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service and product support information of L'Allier et al. to include saving the progress of the custom training sequence linked to the user's login, as taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to give users the flexibility of being able to stop the training in the middle and come back to it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lesson he has already taken.

Referring to claims 22 and 23, while L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, they fail to teach retrieving the customized training sequence according to the last saved progress responsive to user login of the login identification. Cook et al. teach a system that provides an interactive training sequence similar to that of L'Allier et al. In addition, Cook et al. further teach, retrieving the customized training sequence according to the last saved progress responsive to user login (managing and controlling the training materials presented to the student according to the usage characteristics of that particular student), as recited in column 6, lines 29-32. Since the reference disclosed the ability to record and store a student's progress (column 1, line 60) and the ability to keep track of the relative position of the student in the lesson, the system is able to retrieve the training sequence according to the last saved position of the sequence. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of L'Allier et al. and Cook et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for providing service and product support information of L'Allier et al. to include retrieval of the training sequence according to the last saved progress, as taught by Cook et al. It would have been advantageous to utilize such a combination in order to give users the flexibility

Art Unit: 2173

of being able to stop the training in the middle and come back to it in a more convenient time in the future, without having to repeat the lesson he has already taken.

7. Claims 11, 15-16 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over L'Allier et al. U.S. Patent 6,606,480, as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Judd et al. U.S. Patent 5,602,982.

Referring to claim 11, L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claim 9 above. Specifically, L'Allier et al. teach a guided tour module for displaying a series of introductory documents (initial sequence of displaying titles and related text and selection of an introduction to display) of the product service information in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (column 20, lines 52-59), a feedback module for allowing users to send comments (the system accepts user responses) (column 3, lines 11-18), a practice module for displaying practice exam forms (such as pre-assessment forms and evaluation questions) (column 3, lines 5-30) in a user understandable format responsive to user selection information and an information module for displaying additional contact information relating to the service information in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (displaying additional information such as a post-evaluation test for users to take) (column 3, lines 31-38). However, L'Allier et al. fail to teach an index module for displaying a hyperlink index of the service information. Judd et al. teach an interactive training system similar to that of L'Allier et al. In particular, Judd et al. teach a guided tour module for displaying a series of introductory documents in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (shown by the "Show Intro" button in Figure 1) and a feedback module for allowing users to send comments (accepts

user input responses) (column 2, lines 35-47) and an information module for displaying additional contact information relating to the service information in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (as shown by the "Show Me How" reference button "28" in Figure 3A). In addition, Judd et al. further teach an index module for displaying a hyperlink index of service information (training material) in a user understandable format responsive to user selection (column 4, lines 23-30 and shown by the menu of tasks in Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of L'Allier et al. and Judd et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interactive training system of L'Allier to include the index module taught by Judd et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide an easy and convenient overview of the training materials available for the users to learn from.

Referring to claims 15 and 16, while L'Allier et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, they fail to teach a hyperlink table of contents for the documents of the simulation. Judd et al. teach an interactive training system similar to that of L'Allier et al. In particular, Judd et al. teach a table of contents for the documents of the simulation (index of available tasks to be run for the training program) (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of L'Allier et al. and Judd et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interactive training system of L'Allier to include the table of contents taught by Judd et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide an easy and convenient overview of the training materials available for the users to learn from.

Referring to claim 24, L'Allier et al. teach the feedback module configured to send comments over the Internet (accepting user responses through a web-based system), as recited in column 2, lines 35-47 and column 4, lines 46-52.

Referring to claim 25, L'Allier et al. teach the practice module configured to indicate whether the user choices for the exam form is correct or incorrect (evaluating the user responses relative to a predetermined standard), as recited in column 2, lines 11-18.

8. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar systems and methods for providing a customized interactive training sequence.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-25 and 27-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. The applicant asserts that the abstract has been amended to comply with language and format requirements, however, no amendments to the abstract have been received and therefore, the original objections stand.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 3, 2004


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173